

By Authority.



WILLIAM J. BRODIE, Esq., has this day been appointed an Agent to grant Marriage Licenses for the District of North Kohala, Island of Hawaii.

L. A. THURSTON,
Minister of the Interior.
Interior Office, Dec. 9, 1887. 1196 31

School Notice.

BY ORDER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.

The regular Christmas vacation of all Public Schools in the Kingdom, will extend from FRIDAY, the 14th of December inst., to WEDNESDAY, the 4th of January, 1888.

W. J. SMITH, Secretary,
Education Office, Dec. 2, 1887. 1195-31 105 31

For Sale.

The Hawaiian Bark KAIMILOA, with auxiliary steam power, as she now lies in the harbor. The vessel is in first-class order and repair. Particulars concerning the machinery and outfit can be obtained at the Interior Department.

LORRIN A. THURSTON,
Minister of the Interior.
Honolulu, Oct. 13, 1887. 02 1188-11

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR.

HONOLULU, NOV. 30, 1887.
In accordance with the provisions of Section 201 of the Civil Code, I have this day set apart an enclosure for the impounding of estrays at KALAOA 1, and HAWANAWANA on the main side of the Government road, in the District of North Kohala, Hawaii.

L. A. THURSTON,
Minister of the Interior.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 202 of the Civil Code, I have appointed GEO. D. HUBB, Found Master, for the above pond in North Kohala, Hawaii.

ULULANI,
Governor of Hawaii.
Office of Governor of Hawaii, Nov. 30, 1887. 1195 31

In re the Trustees of the Fort Street Church and Congregation.

WHEREAS, a Corporation originally chartered as the Second Foreign Church and Congregation of Honolulu, which name and style was, by Resolution of Privy Council, on the 28th day of January, 1856, changed to the Trustees of Fort Street Church and Congregation, has, pursuant to the Laws in such case made and provided, duly filed, with the undersigned, a petition for the dissolution of the said Corporation, together with a Certificate thereto annexed, as required by law; now, therefore,

Notice is hereby given to any and all persons who have been or are now interested in any manner whatsoever in the said Corporation, that objections to the granting of the said petition must be filed in the Interior Office on or before the 20th day of January, 1888, and that any person or persons desiring to be heard thereon must be in attendance at the said Interior Office, in Alouani Hale, Honolulu, at 11 a.m. of that day, and show cause why said petition should not be granted.

L. A. THURSTON,
Minister of Interior.
Interior Office, Nov. 23, 1887. 1191 106

PIERRE JONES, Esq., has this day been appointed Commissioner of Penes for the District of Kona, Oahu. The Board now consists as follows:

J. F. BROWN,
D. Kahana,
P. Jones.
L. A. THURSTON,
Minister of Interior.
Interior Office, Nov. 23, 1887. 1194 31

Sale of Lease of Government Land.

ON TUESDAY, December 20, 1887, at the front entrance of Aliolani Hale, at 12 noon, will be sold the Lease of the Government Lot situated on the main, Waikiki, corner of Richards and Queen streets, Honolulu, for a term of 12 years.

TERMS: Upset price \$100 per annum, payable semi-annually in advance.

L. A. THURSTON,
Minister of Interior.
Interior Office, Nov. 14, 1887. 1192 61

New Advertisements.

LIST OF LETTERS!

REMAINING IN THE GENERAL POST-OFFICE, Honolulu, Nov. 30, 1887:

Aass, Otto	Appleton, Mrs. G. A.
Baerle, Wm	Bassett, F.
Bonelli, Mr.	Banning, Rudolph
Blackie, Jas.	Blackie, Jas.
Coggeshall, Wm	Conrad, E.
Cameron, Capt. J.	Cochill, Mrs. S. T.
Clark, J. B.	Campbell, J. T.
Dovey, Mrs. J. J.	Dane, Major H. C.
Davis, Mrs. E.	Dalglish, Jas. C.
Davis, Peter P.	Davis, Peter
Emmerand, Schultz	
Fernandez, Peter	Folger, Geo. E.
Flay, L.	Franch, Yasso
Gey, W. H. C.	Gracia, Geo.
Gunt, Calvin	
Hocking, A.	Herzog, C. A.
Hutaphy, A.	Hasbidge, K.
Howell, Louis	Hanks, W. S.
Herbert, Henry	
Janson, Arvid	Jyrgesen, O.
Kaiser, F.	Kamer, Capt.
Kidd, Thomas (2)	Krain, Y. Chen
Karlsson, L.	Kohler, Fritz
Konrad, E.	
Lamson, Mr.	Luscomb, H. A.
Lindsay, Kanala	Lewis, Oliver H.
Messmer, Jno. (3)	McEvoy, Jno. (2)
Macfadden, Ernest (2)	Murdock, J.
Nissen, Capt. H.	Noah, Mrs. Libbie
O'Dowda, Thos.	
Peter Gast	Piutti, O.
Perry, Wm.	Peary, Mr.
Parrell, Tom	
Rice, Geo.	Roberson, R.
Reuter, Henry	Richard & Co., Messrs
Reed, Mrs. J. T.	Reese, Henry (2)
Slaughter, H.	Spencer, Master C. (2)
Sharr, Albert Ed.	Scott, Chas.
Strand, R.	Schubert, L.
Stewart, M.	
Turner, F.	Thompson, C. P.
Tollison, O.	
Wilson, James	Weary, Mrs. H.

Parties inquiring for letters in the above list will please ask for "Advertised Letters."

F. WUNDERBERG,
General P. O. Honolulu, H. I. P. M. G.

Hawaiian Gazette

EST. 1838 IN HAWAII.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1887.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

VOLUME 22 of the WEEKLY GAZETTE ends with the paper issued on Dec. 27. The new volume will not be sent to any except those who have paid in advance. Hereafter there will be no deviation from this rule of prepayment.

BEHRING SEA
AND THE
RIGHT OF SOVEREIGNTY OVER IT.

Our readers are aware that the question of the sovereignty of Behring Sea has arisen during the past few years, based on the plea that it belongs to the class called "open seas," which under the law of nations are public property, outside of one marine league from the shore, or from headland points of bays or gulfs. On this assumption, cruisers have, during the past few years, been fitted out expressly for the purpose of capturing seals found in the sea beyond the limits named. Under instructions from the American Government, there have been a number of seizures and confiscation of these vessels engaged in sealing in its waters, which had no permission to cruise there for the object named. In the minds of those who are fully posted in the different phases of this new international question, there can be no doubt that the United States Government possesses the same rights in and over the Behring Sea that Russia formerly possessed and exercised over it, and now enforces over the fish breeding portions of the Ochotsk Sea, for the purpose of protecting its fisheries.

As far back as 1820 to 1830, Russia claimed exclusive authority over the Ochotsk and Behring Seas and the Arctic Ocean, as being inland seas, over which she held exclusive right, and when the New Bedford whaler began to extend their cruises into her waters, the United States sought and secured a treaty granting to its citizens the privilege of cruising there, and of fishing and trading with the natives. This treaty is dated April, 1824. By seeking the privileges obtained, and making this treaty, the United States acknowledged the sovereignty of Russia over these inland seas, and also acknowledged that it possessed no rights there except such as were conceded by the treaty. These facts are of record, and any international convention that undertakes the adjustment of this question, must recognize the existence and authority of these established rights, as having a forcible bearing in its adjustment.

In March, 1867, the United States, by a formal treaty, purchased the Russian possessions in America, paying seven millions, two hundred thousand dollars for all of Russia's right, title and interest in them, whatever they may have been. In this convention, the boundaries are clearly defined. The western boundary of the Russian possessions, as specified by Article 1 of this treaty, is stated to be as follows:

"The western limit within which the territories and dominion covered are contained, passes through a point in Behring's Straits on the parallel of sixty-five degrees, thirty minutes north latitude, at its intersection with the meridian which passes midway between the islands of Krusenstern or Ignolode, and the island of Ratmanoff or Noonarook, and proceeds due north without limitation, into the same frozen ocean. The same western limit, beginning at the same initial point, proceeds thence in a course nearly southwest, through Behring's Straits, and Behring Sea, so as to pass midway between the northwest point of the island of St. Lawrence and the southeast point of Cape Choukotski, to the meridian of one hundred and seventy-two degrees west longitude; thence from the intersection of that meridian, in a south-westerly direction, so as to pass midway between the island of Attoo and the Copper Island of the Kommandor group, in the North Pacific Ocean, to the meridian of one hundred and ninety-three degrees west longitude; so as to include in the territory conveyed the whole of the Aleutian Islands east of that meridian."

A reference to almost any chart or map showing Behring Sea, will enable the reader to ascertain the main points referred to in the treaty, as forming the boundary. These are Behring's Straits, St. Lawrence Island, Behring's Island, Attoo Island and Queen Charlotte's Island on the American coast. Attoo, or Copper Island, is the small island (seldom named on maps) lying near and southeast of Behring's Island. Draw a pencil line on the chart, commencing in the middle of Behring's Straits, and passing south-westerly through the middle of the straits between St. Lawrence Island and Cape Choukotski on the Asiatic coast, thence to Attoo Island, and thence to the American main land above Queen Charlotte's Island, so as to include all of the Aleutian or Fox Islands. Queen Charlotte's Island is the most northern point of British America in the Pacific. On some American charts this boundary line is engraved to show the western and southern boundaries of the Alaskan purchase and territory.

This large triangular enclosure of Behring Sea and the Aleutian Islands bordering it on the south, are known as the home and breeding ground of the North Pacific fur seals. The mothers and their young are found during the summer swimming in it hundreds of miles from the nearest land. The sovereignty of the sea north of this chain of islands is of more value than that of the land, for unless the seals can have unmolested freedom to cruise throughout its whole extent, the value of the commerce in them, which now brings to the United States treasury one hundred thousand dollars a year, will soon be reduced, and eventually

rendered worthless. Abundance of evidence can be obtained from those familiar with the seal fishery, to corroborate this statement, and to show the importance of preserving this breeding ground for the use and perpetuation of this important branch of national industry. Russia claimed and exercised for a century or more, the right to protect her seal fishery, and the United States, as her lawful successor in the premises, has done the same. It is only within the past few years that attempts have been made to poach on this national sealing domain, by applying to it the common law of freedom of the sea, beyond one marine league from the shore, while most of the seals killed by trespassers are females and their young, found often many miles from land, the killing of which is prohibited by law.

To all intents and purposes, Behring Sea may be properly termed and should be regarded, as an enclosed sea, as effectually enclosed as if the United States owned the Asiatic coast on the west, inasmuch as the imaginary line extending from Behring's Straits to Attoo Island, having been proposed and granted by the nation owning the shore beyond, is as legitimate and binding against all poachers as though the Asiatic coast itself formed the boundary. While on the south, the Aleutian chain of Islands makes as well defined a boundary as does the coast of Alaska on the east. If the sovereignty of Behring Sea is to be abandoned by the United States, which purchased it for the specific object of securing the valuable rights of fishery contained in it, and the possession of which trespassers on the rights of no other power, then not only will these national industries be soon destroyed, but her whole purchase from Russia will be rendered comparatively worthless.

Viewed in this light, the claim of the United States to the sovereignty over Behring Sea as a fur sealing domain, is as real and valuable as if it were land, and must be recognized as such by every government and by the civilized world. No other construction can be given to it by impartial statesmen of any country who examine into the facts on which the claim rests.

EARLY in the present session the GAZETTE, being the first journal to do so, advanced the opinion that it would be expedient and proper for the Legislature to despatch only the special business for which it was primarily convened. To some extent this view has been carried out, many measures and petitions having been laid over till the regular session in May. It must be admitted, however, that a good deal of business not absolutely emergent to the occasion has been pressed forward to completion. The question arises as to whether all this fresh legislation has been effected unadvisedly. Our evening contemporary seems to think so, but we think it takes a one-sided view of the question. It says that ten or twelve days should have sufficed for the necessary work of the session. Had our contemporary looked at the matter in another light it might have added ten or twelve days more to the limit. Some of the special business of the session—the most important part thereof—has been before the Legislature in different phases almost since the opening day, each succeeding occasion coming up irradiated with a new glimmer of light and marked with fresh apertures for the admission of the air of healthy discussion. This illumination and ventilation were due to the patient investigation of committees, through processes that required time for their proper operation. Had the Legislature adopted our advice too strictly, it would have had to rush through matters of weighty import without sufficient investigation, or make frequent adjournments to allow committees to pursue their work with necessary deliberation. While these principal measures were being thus exposed to the most careful deliberation, there is no good reason why other useful legislation should not have been performed. Again, the continuance of the session has stimulated enquiry into many subjects of past administration and prospective policy which could not to the advantage of the public have been deferred to the regular session. Indeed, the Legislature deserves great praise for having elicited information from the Ministers on matters of the greatest moment, some of them belonging to the past regime. Otherwise, these things might have remained hidden, even from the Ministers themselves, whom present concerns may well engage sufficiently to preclude their going very deep into all the tomes of their predecessors' record.

But, to go back to the beginning, has the session been unduly lengthy? We deny that it has. On the contrary it has not yet exceeded the moderate estimate of one month or six weeks put forth in this paper, uninspired if you please but yet not criticized in any quarter so far as known. The Bulletin betrays something akin to party feeling, moreover, when it insinuates the cause of what it assumes to be an unduly protracted session as being the want of efficient directorship. Now the fact is that the proceedings of the Legislature have gone along with remarkable smoothness, as well as concord between Ministers and elective members, so that the lack of professional political leaders has not been seriously apparent. There has withal been presented a spectacle of independence of voice and vote without the fierceness of party warfare which might be emulated with advantage by Legislatures of much larger countries where responsible government has been in vogue for

generations. In another article our evening contemporary charges the Legislature with precipitancy in effecting legislation that the country has not demanded and against which itself and a certain legal gentleman had raised warning voices. Probably the representatives of the people have as correct ideas of what the country wants as either the Bulletin or its distinguished correspondent. At all events neither of those authorities has given one clear, definite or valid reason against the specific legislation that they wanted delayed. We contend that in the main all the legislation effected by the Legislature at this session has been in the line of what the best public opinion has for years demanded. Some of it has been designed for the undoing of the mischievous reactionary policy of the last administration. Much of it and part of what our contemporary's writers have antagonized, has been found imperatively necessary by Ministers to enable them to administer efficiently the affairs of their departments.

APPARENTLY the military question has been the bete noir of the extra session. Thursday, however, the Legislature grappled with it, advancing to the last stage a measure that may be deemed generally satisfactory. This is saying a good deal in view of the many diverse opinions that have been bandied about town in respect to the matter. Properly speaking, the country requires no soldiers maintained at the public expense. And yet, under the monarchical system that we have, some military establishment is expected, more for show, perhaps, and royal state than for any actual service. This idea has some advocates and is supported by precedent. That being conceded, the provision for Household Guards to the strength of sixty-five, as made in the bill, is modest enough. So much for show.

Some volunteer organization may be wisely kept up at the public expense, for service in the event of riot or other domestic disturbance requiring force to preserve the peace. The necessary expense for maintaining such a volunteer organization is properly made payable by the state, while all enrolled in it, with the exception of the commanding officer, serve without pay. If called out by the Government to preserve the public peace, then for actual service the members of the command should be remunerated. A moderate salary has rightly been voted the commanding officer. His position is efficiently filled is necessarily exacting, if not thankless at times, and his salary represents pay for standing and serving in a responsible capacity. The man for the place should be qualified by education and experience to acquit himself with credit, in time of trouble as well as in time of peace.

THE extraordinary session of the first Legislative Assembly under the Constitution of Kalakaua I. is apparently nearing its close. In another article we have spoken of the concord that has existed throughout between the Ministers and the elective membership. The Assembly has shown full confidence in the Ministry. Even when a majority of the Assembly were convinced that the Ministry had made a serious misstep, in the Wai-mea Crown prosecution case, the vote of censure that, passing, would have turned the Cabinet out, was altered to a reproving expression of opinion in the case. This action indicated what must be deemed a wise conservatism, the members seemingly being imbued with the spirit of Abraham Lincoln's proverb, "It is not wise to swap horses while crossing the stream." The mild disapproval of a breach of the spirit of the Constitution placed on record will probably be as beneficial as the more drastic proposal that was dropped. It does not follow that the Assembly elected under a pledge to support this Cabinet will condone more direct breaches of the law or wanton repetitions of even such a comparatively venial offense as the one in question. Burke's definition of the main function of a legislature was that it was a control which could not be abrogated for mere party support without grave injury to the interests of the people. Our Legislature has, we think the country will agree, mingled wholesome control with generous support most judiciously. The members of the Cabinet, particularly those just on the threshold of public life, have developed many sterling qualities, besides laying themselves open to criticism as little as any Ministry that could be generally agreed upon at present. They have not yet had the full and fair trial that is the acknowledged right of every responsible Ministry. Therefore, a change just now would reflect upon the stability of national affairs—more abroad, where the circumstances would be imperfectly known, than here—and not be endorsed by the mass of people beyond a small circle of aspirants to office. The Ministers are of course liable to err like the ablest statesmen of any country, but we believe that the nation as a whole has confidence in their integrity, capacity for affairs, and earnest purpose to do their best by the people. There have been features of the conduct of the present session, on the part of both Ministry and elective members, which could be much improved by borrowing from older systems of responsible government. These it shall be our purpose to elaborate during the recess, in the assurance that the suggestions will be taken by those concerned as by reasonable men. In the meantime changes of rulers in this transition stage should be deprecated. Let us have peace and internal development, and the Ministry watch more vigilantly than ever that they do not

give occasion for bringing the principles of true reform into jeopardy.

THE cry against centralization is no unfamiliar sound in other countries. It often amounts to a fierce agitation. Sometimes it succeeds in the changing of Cabinets or systems. Again the opposing policy of decentralization meets with crushing and lasting defeat. Centralization is right as often as it is wrong. Circumstances decide the question, although perhaps might make the wrong win at times. It was against centralization of sovereignty in matters affecting national character that the Southern Confederacy revolted. The doctrine of "State Rights" was essentially one of decentralization, but it drew forth patriotic enthusiasm for the integrity of the sovereign Union, which rallied force enough to make that policy of decentralization the "lost cause." There can be no question in the minds of Americans who believe in their country as "one and inseparable, now and forever," that centralization was the true principle in that terrible crisis. But if any statesman should arise in the United States to agitate for centralization that would take away individual State Governments, with the local autonomy enjoyed in such from the birth of the Constitution, that statesman would be politically dead in quicker time than it took him to prepare his first speech, and there would not be enough mourners at the funeral to make it respectable. That would be carrying centralization too far, and the people would have none of it.

Canadians who are opposed to Sir John Macdonald's regime see centralization to be resisted in what they deem encroachments of the Federal Government upon the functions given the Provincial Governments by their Constitution, the Imperial Act of Confederation. An instance of such centralization in the Dominion has just been exhibited in the interference of the Federal Government with the policy of the Manitoba Government to have a railway built down the Red River Valley to connect with the American system. There are grounds of just complaint, we think, against the Dominion Government for pushing the idea of centralization too far in regard to that as well as other matters. Again, in the United Kingdom we see more than one movement afoot to accomplish what is generally recognized would be desirable decentralization. Such are the Home Rule movement for Ireland, with the other Kingdoms likely to come in for the same privilege, and the agitation for some sort of responsible municipal government for the great metropolis. All the foregoing facts and examples show that the question as to whether centralization is right or wrong, whenever raised, must be decided by the circumstances of the particular case.

SOME remarks are due in reply to the Bulletin's speculations regarding our position in respect to the power of appointment and dismissal rightly to be vested in Ministers. As the laws are administered by Ministers to a very large extent through the medium of subordinate officials, in equal degree do Ministers become responsible for the conduct of such officials. Our position is simply that Ministers should have control in proportion to their responsibility, and that they are as responsible for such control as for the exercise of their other functions. It would certainly be an abuse of that control for Ministers to dismiss officials without knowledge of their incompetence or misconduct, or investigation into charges of either of these counts. Our contemporary cites the systems of the United Kingdom, Cape Colony and Australia, where charges must be substantiated against an official before the Minister can dismiss him. In the United Kingdom, and from the citation of our contemporary we should judge in the colonies named, there is an established civil service system through which Ministerial control is exercised. The Bulletin calls the thing in question "this absolute power placed in the hands of Ministers," and doubts "if it exists in any constitutional colony." It does exist, we may say, in the Dominion of Canada, the oldest British constitutional colony, in the identical form wherein it has been adopted here. That is, the Ministry is only responsible for the power of appointment and dismissal of officials to public opinion or the electorate and to the Legislature. It is competent for any member of the Legislature to require of a Minister the laying before Parliament of reasons and correspondence relating to any official change. The exercise of absolute Ministerial power in this regard, subject to legislative review, has within the past few years been emphatically endorsed by the highest judicial authority of the empire. Hon. Letellier de St. Just, Governor of the Province of Quebec, dismissed his Ministry while it was supported by a majority in the representative branch of the Legislature, because he would not assent to a wholesale sacrifice of Provincial property in a certain railway. An appeal to the electors resulted in the dismissed Ministry being left in a minority. Liberal politicians whose party thus came into power in the Province held that the popular verdict at the polls was a justification of the almost unprecedented action of the Governor. The Conservative Federal Government, however, declined to accept the view of the popular vote having such retroactive virtue. Therefore the Federal Cabinet resolved to dismiss the Provincial Governor on the ground of his alleged unconstitutional action in the dismissal of his Ministry. Lord Lorne, then Governor-General of the Domini-

on, hesitated about signing the demand for the Governor's resignation, and called to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for instructions how to act. The reply came back promptly, "Follow the advice of your constitutional advisers."

On Friday, December 9, 1887, the Legislature received from the King two bills without the royal signature, accompanied by His Majesty's reasons for not signing them. The first is the bill abolishing Governors, the second providing for the discharge of duties heretofore performed by the Governors. It appears that the royal veto in this case was a surprise to the Ministers, as the King had assured them the previous day that he should take their advice by signing all the bills passed by the Legislature. Regarding the power of veto the Constitution (Article 48) says:

"Every bill which shall have passed the Legislature shall, before it becomes law, be presented to the King. If he approve he shall sign it and it shall thereby become a law, but, if not, he shall return it, with his objections, to the Legislature, which shall enter the objections at large on their journal and proceed to reconsider it. If after such reconsideration it shall be approved by a two-thirds vote of all the elective members of the Legislature, it shall become a law."

It therefore looks as if these measures passed by a large majority of the Legislature must be passed again by a two-thirds vote, leaving out the Ministers. This is the way the Legislature seems to have taken the subject, having appointed Monday, the 19th instant, for the reconsideration above prescribed.

It may fairly be claimed that some of the recent utterances of our over-wise contemporary, the Bulletin, with reference to the present Ministry and Legislature have been not only unfair and apparently malicious, but puerile and ridiculous as well. Witness the childish and spiteful fling in Tuesday's issue at what it is pleased to call "inexperienced Ministers and amateur Legislators." Perhaps the Bulletin will be good enough to tell us what it means by "amateur" Legislators. Our neighbor may have a special dictionary compiled for its own use, but we understand the antithesis of "amateur" to be "professional," and if the language used means anything, and if any inference can be drawn therefrom, it must be that one of the crying wants of this country is a body of "professional" legislators. Just what "professional" legislators may be and wherein they are superior to the "amateur" variety is something which we confess we do not quite understand. We know what professional politicians are, and we have been led from a somewhat extensive observation of such persons to regard them as rather a scurvy lot, a class whose absence from the active management of public affairs is very much to be desired.

The "professional" politician is fortunately very scarce in our present Legislative body, and it is doubtless owing to this fact that so large an amount of business has been so well done in so short a time, with so little unpleasant friction and with such a general subordination of private and personal interests to the general public good. So far as inexperienced Ministers are concerned, it may be remarked that Mr. Green is a gentleman of mature years, fine general culture, large experience in Hawaiian affairs and now serving his third term as a Cabinet Minister. Mr. Brown is certainly neither a chicken in years nor a tyro in public business. It is true that neither Mr. Thurston nor Mr. Ashford has ever before held a ministerial position, but they are neither of them boys, they are both possessed of unquestionable talent, and Mr. Thurston has had experience in legislative matters wherein he made for himself a record which may, without any exaggeration, be called splendid, the files of the Bulletin during the session of 1886 being our witness. Perhaps our contemporary holds that no man should ever be a Cabinet Minister unless he has been a Cabinet Minister before, which is like the good old lady who cautioned her son never to go near the water until he had learned to swim.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE panic is not likely to be in the labor market but in the loaner market—caused by the arrival of 1,460 Japanese.

A GREAT many people seem to be ignorant of the requirement, in anything written for the press, that only one side of the paper should be used. By rights a communication written on both sides should be peremptorily rejected, although we have strained the point frequently of late rather than disappoint correspondents who had anything worth printing.

AMONG the items which the special committee on the Likeliest funeral bills recommended to be paid out of the public treasury, there appears the following: "Capas, etc., for men to draw hearse." Before paying out any money for this item, it would be well for the disbursing officers of the Government to ascertain if the capas in question are not the same familiar articles which we have met of us seen doing duty on various former occasions, festive and otherwise; and if so, whether they have not been already paid for at least once at the public expense. If the Government pays for these things, they of course become public property. Such is the case, the question naturally suggests itself, where and in whose custody are these goods at the present time?